

REMARKS

Independent claims 1, 13, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by King (US 6,307,549). Independent claim 1 has been amended to call for audibly providing a plurality of user selectable sentence portion options, at least one sentence portion option including at least two words.

In the Office action, element 70 of King was referenced as showing a list of multiple words as options. Element 70 is a selection list region where a selection list 76 of possible interpretations of keystrokes is provided. Column 7, lines 14-18. However, the individual entries on the list 76 fail to include more than one word. In King, a keystroke sequence is initially matched to words as the keys are entered. Due to the ambiguity of the keystrokes, however, more than one word may be identified. Thus, each entry on the list only corresponds to one word. *See, e.g.*, column 7, lines 21-45. Because King does not provide user selectable sentence portion options where a particular sentence portion option may include at least two words, King fails to anticipate amended claim 1 or claims dependent thereon.

Under a similar analysis, King also does not anticipate independent claim 24 or claims dependent thereon.

Independent claim 13 has been amended to recite enable a user to modify a selected sentence portion by providing a word to complete the selected sentence portion. As explained above, King provides single word entries on a list. Because a particular entry in King does not include more than one word, an entry is not modified to complete the entry; the entry is complete on its own. As such, King fails to anticipate amended claim 13 and claims dependent thereon.

Claims 3-10, 15-22, 26, 27, 28, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over King in view of Stoddard. Obviousness is established by showing a motivation, suggestion, or teaching of the desirability of making the specific combination that was claimed by the applicant. *See In re Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 U.S.P.Q.2d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Further, particular findings must be provided regarding a motivation, suggestion, or teaching to modify. *Id.* Referring to claim 3 as an example, the examiner has failed to show where the art teaches or suggests the

desirability of doing what the applicant has done. Thus, it appears that the rejection is based on inappropriate hindsight reasoning. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that *prima facie* obviousness has not been established with respect to at least some of dependent claims 3-10, 15-22, 26, 27, 28, and 30.

With respect to claim 30, the examiner states that it would be inherent in Stoddard to provide user selectable message options over a telephone. There is no indication that a *telephone* must necessarily be used in Stoddard. As neither King nor Stoddard teach or suggest audibly receiving selection options over a telephone, the rejection of claim 30 is respectfully traversed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. The examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

The commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (ITL.0539US).

Respectfully submitted,



Date: May 18, 2005

Rhonda L. Sheldon, Reg. No. 50,457
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation